

REMARKS

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner stated that claims 1-10 are allowed.

The Examiner stated further that Claim 20 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding claim 20, independent base claim 16 has been rewritten to include the allowable subject matter from claim 20 and claim 20 has been canceled. There are no intervening claims. Since either the dependent claim or the base claim can be rewritten to be allowable when there are no intervening claims and the dependent claim is otherwise allowable, base claim 16 has been rewritten.

Claims 18-19 depend from now allowable claim 16 and are now allowable.

Claim Objections

Claim 17 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

“Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. The type of material (solder with or without voids) to be reflowed does not further limit the reflow apparatus.”

Regarding claim 17, this claim has been canceled.

The Examiner stated that in claims 11-20 the term system is interpreted as an apparatus for performing soldering for examination purposes.

Applicants agree with the above characterization.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

Claims 11-13 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Nakao et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,188,280, hereinafter “Nakao”).

Regarding claims 11-13 and 15, these claims have been canceled.

Regarding claim 16, this claim has been rewritten to include allowable subject matter from claim 20.

Regarding claim 17, this claim has been canceled.

Claims 11-13 and 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Nishikawa et al. (U.S. Patent No 5,516,031, hereinafter “Nishikawa”).

Regarding claims 11-13 and 15, these claims have been canceled.

Regarding claim 16, this claim has been rewritten to include allowable subject matter from claim 20.

Regarding claim 17, this claim has been canceled.

Claims 18-19 depend from allowable claim 16.

Claims 11-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Pekol (U.S. Patent No. 5,573,174, hereinafter “Pekol”).

Regarding claims 11-15 and 17, these claims have been canceled.

Regarding claims 16 and 18, claim 16 has been rewritten to include allowable subject matter from claim 20 and claim 18 depends from claim 16.

Claims 11-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Matsuki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,732,911 B2, hereinafter “Matsuki”).

Regarding claims 11-15 and 17, these claims have been canceled.

Regarding claims 16 and 18-19, claim 16 has been rewritten to include allowable subject matter from claim 20, and claims 18-19 depend from claim 16.

Other

The Examiner stated that the prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

“Gieskes (USPN 5031818, system), Kendziora et al. (USPN 3882596, system) and Demaray et al. (USPN 5799860, system).”

The other references cited by the Examiner showing the prior art have been considered and are not believed to disclose, teach, or suggest, either singularly or in combination, Applicants' invention as claimed.

A further reference has been cited in a corresponding Singapore application and is respectfully submitted in an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS): USPN 4,166,563. This reference cited by the Examiner in the Singapore application showing the prior art has been considered and is not believed to disclose, teach, or suggest, either singularly or in combination, Applicants' invention as claimed.

Conclusion

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested. Claims 1-10 have been allowed Allowance of claims 16 and 18-19 at an early date is solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including any extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-0374 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,



Mikio Ishimaru
Registration No. 27,449

The Law Offices of Mikio Ishimaru
333 W. El Camino Real, Suite #330
Sunnyvale, CA 94087
Telephone: (408) 738-0592
Fax: (408) 738-0881
Date: December 9, 2006